

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/757,999	CHOL, DONG-HA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chuck Mah	3677	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Chuck Mah. (3) _____

(2) Mr. Daebeler. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 04 October 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1-39.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: During the personal interview, the amendment filed Sept. 6, 2007 and the response to Notice of Non-compliance amendment filed Sept. 24, 2007 overcame the objection to the drawings, the rejection under 35 USC 112 first paragraph, and rejection of claims 30-39 under 35 USC 112 second paragraph. No agreement regarding claims 14 and 24 was reached. With respect to independent claims 1, 11, 14, 17, and 34, no agreement was reached. However, a more detailed description of the pusher in the claims would appear to patentably distinguish the claims from the cited prior art references.